



TRAFFIC SAFETY AND PARKING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, February 7, 2007 - 6:00 pm

San Bruno City Hall
567 El Camino Real
San Bruno, CA 94066

MINUTES

1. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS -

A. ROLL CALL

<u>TSPC Members:</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
(Acting Chair) Sol Weiner	X	
John Giuseponi	X	
Mark Howard	X	
Doris Maez	X	

Staff in Attendance:

Steve Davis, Public Works Department
Jane Chambers, Public Works Department
Marc Catalano, Police Department

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve by Mark Howard, seconded by John Giuseponi (M/ Howard, S/Giuseponi: 4-0-0) Approved.

3. COMMITTEE ACTIONS

Election of the new Committee Chair and Vice-Chair for 2007: Sol Weiner nominated John Giuseponi as the new chair, seconded by Mark Howard. (M/Weiner, S/ Howard: 4-0-0) Approved. John Giuseponi nominated Mark Howard for Vice-Chair and was seconded by Doris Maez. (M/Giuseponi, S/ Maez: 4-0-0) Approved.

4. OLD BUSINESS

None

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Steve Davis introduced the consideration of the petitioned request for a traffic signal at San Bruno Avenue and Sixth Avenue. The City received a petition in October under the auspices of ACORN to request a traffic signal at this location, and the role of the Traffic Safety and Parking Committee in this matter is to evaluate the request and make a recommendation to the City Council. City staff initiated an evaluation and review of the possibility for a signal at this location and to determine whether a signal is warranted. The standards as to whether the City would approve or disapprove a signal are based on traffic design principles, using The State of California Traffic Design Manual and Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. City staff performed a blended review to evaluate if the required warrants were met for this location.

Warrant evaluation:

1. **Volume at the intersection** brings a number of variables, such as the number of lanes, the major and minor legs of that intersection, and whether it is a rural or an urban intersection. With San Bruno Avenue and Sixth Avenue, the requirement that should be met is an hourly volume of 600 vehicles on the main road and an hourly volume of 200 vehicles on the minor road. To determine whether those numbers were met, City staff went out and visually counted traffic over several days for two-hour blocks starting at 7 am and running through 1 pm in the afternoon. The later afternoon shift ran from 3 pm to 6 pm. Staff looked for the peak 15 minute period at this location, which was between 5:30 and 5:45 pm and used those numbers, multiplied by four, for our average count. The highest volume on San Bruno Avenue was 1,324 vehicles per hour. That is compared against the threshold of 600 vehicles per hour, so for San Bruno Avenue the required threshold is met. On Sixth Avenue, the one-hour peak volume is 88 vehicles and the threshold is 200 vehicles. This displays that the Sixth Avenue leg is much lower than the warrant measures, so just based on volume the signal is not warranted.
2. **Interruption of continuous traffic** looks at volume for a longer time period, which also was not met for this location. With this particular requirement, if it does not meet 100% of the requirement, then it is evaluated to see if it meets 80%. The 80% requirement is met at this location.
3. **Pedestrian volume** requirements for a signal to be warranted are at least 190 pedestrian crossings at the location intersection in an hour. The alternative would be to evaluate the location for a four-hour period to come up with a one-hour average, which would require at least 100 crossings per hour. At this intersection, there were 8 pedestrian crossings in one hour, which is significantly lower than the warrant.
4. **School crossings** would also require the 100 pedestrian crossings per hour requirement, and at this location there were only 8 measured, so it is significantly lower than the warranted amount. Doris Maez wanted to point out that the closest signalized intersection with pedestrian crossing is at 3rd Avenue, which is about 500 meters away from this location.
5. **The location of the requested intersection in relation to other signalized intersections**, of which the closest is at the Highway 101/San Bruno Avenue intersection 100 meters away, and Third Avenue, which is 500 meters away. With the location of these two intersections, the proximity warrant requirement is not met.
6. **Accident history** warrants would include a broad side collision due to a right of way violation. In the past year, there have been three documented accidents that fall within this description at this intersection. The threshold for a signalization requirement would be five or more accidents at the intersection that fall into this description, so again this location falls below the requirement. Doris Maez confirmed that sideswipes and rear ender accidents do not count. Steve Davis responded that the statistic desired is accidents that would be mitigated by the installation of the signal, so there were a higher total number of accidents but these types of accidents are not corrected by a signal.

7. **The parameters of the intersection** were reviewed by City staff at a volume of 1404 peak hour approaches and the measured volume of approaches. Again, City staff took the peak number and multiplied it by four, which came to 1324. This is below the system warrant.
8. **Volume warrant review**, in which City staff reviews Items 1 and 2 and clarifies that if these two items have not met the 100% warrant amount, do they meet the 80% warrant amount. In this case, Item 1 did not meet the 80% requirement and Item 2 did meet it. If both are not met at the 80% requirement, then the determination is that the warrant is not met.
9. **Review of the peak four-hour period** is based on the geometry of the intersection, such as the number of lanes and the major and minor directions. On the minor leg, there were 76 vehicles during the peak four hour time period and the threshold for this warrant would be 80 vehicles. The minimum threshold was not met, which again means this intersection did not qualify.
10. **Peak hour delay** is pretty low at this intersection, particularly on the minor leg of the intersection. The delay period is not met according to the warrant, which was calculated using the peak hour numbers. The minor leg had 76 vehicles and the minimum threshold is 100 (minimum) vehicles per hour for each of four and eight hour blocks of time.

Steve Davis stated that the assessment done by staff shows that this intersection does not meet any of the warrants required to justify a signal at this location. The original request talked about a perception that there was a high volume of pedestrian crossings at this location, but that was not borne out in the counts. City staff did counts over a two-week period at different times on different days to try and accurately evaluate this location. The conclusion is that a traffic signal is not warranted at this location.

Steve Davis stated the next step would be to evaluate the primary concerns at this location so City staff can clarify if there are other mitigating things that can be done at the intersection. There is going to be a striping improvement program from San Bruno Avenue all the way to Highway 101 to El Camino Real as soon as there is a break in the winter weather and there is no strain on our storm prevention work. The striping will be happening in the near future, but there is not an exact date set at this time. Other possibilities have been discussed with staff, including the installation of pedestrian paddles and other things to improve pedestrian crossing safety.

Steve Davis emphasized that City staff did a thorough job to identify volume and pedestrian issues. Doris Maez asked about the description of "critical approach speed is 33 mph" and asked for clarification on what this means. Steve Davis responded that is based on the width of the roadway and the number of lanes. In May 2005, City staff did a speed study on San Bruno Avenue and as a result of that the actual speed people were traveling resulted in a reduction in the speed limit. The average speed of 85% of the vehicles traveling on San Bruno Avenue was 27 mph, but the critical approach speed is actually based on the geometry of the roadway.

Mark Howard asked about the statement on page 3 of 5 of the staff report "between 5 and 6 pm left turning San Bruno Avenue traffic". It is illegal to make a left turn there between 4 and 6 pm on weekdays. Marc Catalano confirmed that this is correct. Steve Davis stated that the staff report discusses the need for additional enforcement to reduce the left turn usage in the field.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPENED

Resident, 768 Easton, is concerned about the intersection crossing Easton onto San Bruno Avenue, especially by the donut shop. Steve Davis responded that the installation of a lighted crosswalk is not within the authority of the TSPC, but City staff are going to try and identify other locations that may benefit from lighted crosswalks and put something together for future CIP programs. As it moves forward residents can voice their requests, as this is something that would have to be approved by the City Council. Jane Chambers commented that we have gathered information from other City agencies and the crosswalk are about \$50,000, so this would have to be considered as a Capital Improvement.

Sol Weiner commented that City staff and the TSPC can also look into grants for this work. It is not going to be forgotten by the TSPC and we will follow it all the way to the City Council.

Mark Howard also stated that the speed limit has been reduced on San Bruno Avenue by 5 mph, so hopefully that will help with safety. We have also talked about re-striping the crosswalks and re-marking the lanes, as well as grants for increased enforcement and a lighted signal there.

Alice Barnes, 544 5th Avenue, stated she has seven questions. Where you list each warrant and the number of points each received, is it possible to be told what the maximum number of points available were? Steve Davis responded that if the warrant is not met, then the points are not accumulated. The first thing we look at is if the warrants are met, and if they are, that gives us measure of the need for the signal. In this case, the warrants were not met so staff did not focus on the points. Alice responded that her concern with that response is that residents do not get a good idea of how many points were lost in any particular warrant. Warrant 8 shows five points and two points adding up to seven, but five out of how many? Steve confirmed he would answer this question directly to Alice at a later date.

Alice asked about the traffic count being made for fifteen minutes and then multiplied by four, and wanted clarification about the studies that were done for five hours. Were these studied for one hour and then multiplied also? Steve Davis responded that the measurements were in 15-minute blocks, such as from 7 am to 7:15 am, and then the maximum 15 minutes in each particular category was then multiplied by four. It was not the same 15 minutes for the different categories. Alice responded that if you look at Warrant 4, there are certainly a lot more than 8 children crossing at this location, so if it was only done for 15 minutes, then what time was used? 7 to 7:15 is not an accurate time, so it should be done from 7:45 to 8 am instead.

Alice asked if she should continue with the questions? Sol recommended meeting with Steve Davis directly. Alice was concerned with having her questions being noted in the minutes. Sol confirmed that her questions will be discussed. The third question is regarding Warrant 5, the distance to the nearest signal at Third is 100 feet, and this is on the low end. Mark Howard responded that it is 100 meters, not feet, and it is to the overpass. Alice responded that she still does not think the measure of 100 meters is accurate. Steve Davis confirmed her comments.

Alice commented that she was concerned that her letter from October 2006 was not addressed even before ACORN brought their petition. Alice also asked if anyone knows which grants are available for the City to go after? Her last statement is to consider a post in the middle of San Bruno Avenue similar to San Mateo Avenue, which really makes people stop. Sol Weiner responded that the grants are being looked into by Engineering.

John Giuseponi asked if there is date this issue is going to Council? Steve responded no. John then asked for all of Alice's questions to be answered in the public record. Steve responded that would be done at the next meeting.

Jose Rodriguez, 6th Avenue, commented that the intersection studies done show there will be no lights installed? Sol Weiner responded we have not voted on the issue yet.

Mark Howard responded to Alice Barnes question on Warrant 3 that a minimum of 190 pedestrians per hour is required to meet the criteria, but we are not even close to that amount. Alice responded that she would like clarification on the time of day the counts were done.

Jane Chambers commented that if a copy of her letter is not in the City files, we would contact her.

Resident asked for confirmation that 27 mph was the average speed or 85% speed on San Bruno Avenue. Steve Davis stated the 85% speed was actually 33 mph in the segment studied in May 2005. The speed limit was then reduced to 25 mph.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD CLOSED

Doris Maez asked what kind of enforcement measures have been applied, as most of the traffic there is going faster than 25 mph. Mark Howard commented that at the time the survey was done, the speed limit was 30 mph. Marc Catalano responded that enforcement is performed by the beat officers. Doris then confirmed that the current critical speed is 33 mph for both streets. Steve Davis stated he would confirm this.

Doris Maez asked for clarification on which of the alternatives the Committee should suggest. Steve Davis responded that since the warrants do not support the need for a signal, staff tried to recommend other mitigations. The preference would be to identify what the primary problem is at the location and then tailor solutions to that.

Sol Weiner stated there are other circumstances in lieu of the signal that should be listed as options if the Committee is going to vote on this issue accurately. Steve Davis responded that pedestrian safety seems to be the predominant issue, so City staff could review this and make recommendations at the next meeting.

Mark Howard stated that the residents in the San Bruno Avenue/Easton area felt a traffic signal would fix the intersection. The main problem is the speed at which drivers are coming off the freeway combined with the congestion of the area.

John Giuseponi asked what the average cost is for a four-way stoplight. Steve Davis responded the cost is between \$200,000 to \$300,000. John commented that since the stoplight is not an option, he'd like to have City staff come back to the Committee with all the other options for safety enhancements at this intersection.

Jane Chambers stated she would like to know specifically what the residents' concerns are so City staff can address those directly.

Sol Weiner made a motion to table this issue to the April meeting and have the staff come back at that time with some solutions and responses to the questions regarding the warrants. Doris Maez made a motion to accept the staff recommendation to reject a stoplight installation with the provision that City staff comes back to the Committee with other alternatives that would be most appropriate for this issue. Seconded by John Giuseponi. (M/ Maez, S/Giuseponi: 4-0-0) Approved.

b. Consideration of Requests from Neighbors and Acorn to Install Four Way Stop Signs at Intersection of South San Anselmo Avenue and Santa Dominga Avenue

Steve Davis stated this location currently has a two-way STOP and the request is to upgrade the intersection from a two-way STOP to a four-way STOP. There are three established warrants for evaluating the request:

1. The intersection warrants a signal installation and a STOP sign can be installed for the short term. This warrant does not apply to this issue.
2. An accident warrant where there are broadside collisions of five or more at a location would justify a STOP sign being installed. There have been three reported accidents in the past year, which is less than the warrant requires.
3. The volume warrant states the traffic entering the major street of the intended intersection needs to be 300 vehicles per hour and the minor street needs to be 200 vehicles per hour. San Anselmo would be considered the major street and the eight-hour count was 883 vehicles, so the 1-hour average was 111. At Santa Dominga, the 1-hour average was 48. Based on volume, the warrant was not met for this location.

Steve Davis also commented that pedestrian crossings are considered but during the traffic counting period there were no pedestrian crossings, so City staff gave an estimate of 50 pedestrians. The threshold would be 200 crossings per eight-hour period, so this is also significantly lower than the allowance. City staff also looked at the 85% speed limit for the location based on the speed study from

May of 2005 and it was 29 mph, which is below the 40 mph threshold. Due to the intersection not meeting the requirements listed, staff recommends against the installation of the additional two STOPs. The intersection does have sloping approaches that presents a lack of visibility, so staff recommends prohibiting parking adjacent to the legs of the intersection to improve the visibility. Staff would recommend the installation of approximately 12' of red curb on both legs of San Anselmo to improve visibility.

Mark Howard asked what the speed limit is at the location. Steve Davis responded it is 25 mph. Mark Howard confirmed that about four parking spaces will be lost and Steve Davis concurred with this. Mark Howard asked if we should notice the neighborhood. Steve responded that at the time this is brought before the City Council, it could be noticed to the residents.

Doris Maez confirmed the STOP signs are currently on Santa Dominga. Steve Davis confirmed this.

John Giuseponi asked for the average length of a car. Steve Davis responded the typical parking space is 18'. If the red curbing is kept at 11 to 12 feet, it will preserve some of the parking versus lengthening the red curbing and risking coming up against driveways or other obstacles.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPENED

Shokoofeh Nowbakht, 181 Santa Dominga, stated the cars speed up as they approach the intersection. They are not going 25 mph. There are a lot of kids on this street. She would like to see a 24-hour count instead of a 15-minute count. Steve Davis responded that a 24-hour count was used from the speed survey of May 2005 for this location. She also asked how the number of accidents is counted? Steve Davis responded that the three accidents included in this evaluation were right of way violations where there was a broadside impact, as City staff reviewed accidents that would have been reduced or avoided if a STOP sign were in place.

Mark Howard asked the resident if she felt the counts of the vehicle volume are accurate. She felt the numbers seem higher. Mark Howard asked the resident if she felt the red curbing would help. She felt it would. Ms. Nowbakht also stated that since "Fat Wong's" restaurant has opened on Santa Dominga and El Camino, traffic has increased. She stated that City staff may need to re-do the traffic count, instead of using the 2005 count.

Charlie Miller Ly, 224 South San Anselmo Avenue, stated back in 2001 he had a petition signed by 15 families for a STOP sign to be installed and it was denied. We have asked for a crosswalk on San Anselmo and we have children crossing there to go to school. He stated one day a child will be in wheelchair because of the danger and then how will the City feel? Why won't the City put in a STOP sign? Why for five blocks is there is no STOP sign? He has spoken to Captain Telford and previous City employees and invited them to walk San Luis with him.

Mark Howard confirmed with Steve Davis that there are only unmarked crosswalks on San Anselmo. Steve stated they are all unmarked.

Sol Weiner confirmed that items do take time, but this will not be forgotten.

Kevin Mowil, 165 Santa Dominga, stated that when a driver heads up San Luis to get to Santa Dominga, most are speeding by the time they reach the crest of the hill. Mark Howard asked the resident how fast he thinks cars are going. The resident responded about 35-40 mph. He stated he has to inch out of his driveway in order to avoid being hit by speeding vehicles. Mark Howard responded that installation of the red curb will improve his line of sight by 11 feet. Resident stated that vehicles don't always abide by the rules and Mark responded that enforcement is an issue in this neighborhood. Resident stated there is a five block run between STOP signs and it is not safe near the schools there.

Charlie Miller Ly, 224 South San Anselmo Avenue, asked about speed bumps being installed? Sol Weiner stated the City Council will be reviewing the issue of traffic calming at the next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD CLOSED

Mark Howard made a motion to accept the City staff recommendation to paint the four corners at San Anselmo and Santa Dominga red as noted.

Doris Maez asked to modify the staff's recommendation, as the public comment seems to be that speeding is the issue. Are there other options besides a STOP sign that could be reviewed? Mark Howard amended his motion to accept the City staff recommendation to paint the four corners at San Anselmo and Santa Dominga red as noted, with the additional recommendation to install a police officer and radar trailer at the location to address the peak speeding times. Marc Catalano responded that the Police Department can attempt to comply with the recommendation, but cannot guarantee that an officer could be located there. Mark Howard clarified that the Committee request is to utilize resources, as they are available to alleviate the speeding issue and promote education to drivers in the area.

Mark Howard restated his recommended motion to accept the City staff recommendation to deny the request for the installation of STOP signs at this location, to paint the four corners at San Anselmo and Santa Dominga red as noted, with the additional recommendation to install a police officer and radar trailer at the location to address the peak speeding times and encourage enforcement as the Police Department resources are available. Seconded by Doris Maez. (M/ Howard, S/Maez: 4-0-0) Approved.

6. REPORT OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS AND COMMITTEES –

Doris Maez stated the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee will be meeting on Valentine's Day and reviewing ideas on educating the public about bike and pedestrian safety.

7. SCHEDULE FOR UPCOMING TSPC ITEMS

- A. Steve Davis stated City staff will be coming back to the Committee with a draft of the bylaws.
- B. The request from SamTrans to review the bus/vehicle interaction at Jenevein and San Mateo Avenues and Sneath Lane and Monterey Avenue is being reviewed.
- C. The annual report to the City Council regarding TSPC accomplishments is scheduled for April.
- D. An update on the recruitment for the fifth TSPC member will be reviewed and forwarded to the Committee.
- E. Mark Howard will meet with Frans regarding the two outstanding issues on Sneath Lane.
- F. Maintenance needs to street sweep Commodore Drive by the Archive Building, so City staff is trying to find a time when the vehicles can be cleared and install no parking signs to complete this.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA –

Tom Hamilton, 3481 Crestmoor Drive, spoke for his neighbour, Ann Marie Peponis, 160 Piedmont, who had sent in a letter requesting a three-way STOP sign at Piedmont and Crestmoor Drive to alleviate traffic issues. The sightline is difficult at this location. He wanted to know if it will be agendized. Steve Davis responded that the City has received the letter and it will be added to the next agenda.

Tom Hamilton asked about the education portion for the speeding on Crestmoor Drive, ie the signage and painting. Jane Chambers responded that a work order was sent to the Corporation Yard and it is scheduled. Tom Hamilton stated the work order was written in December. Jane Chambers responded that she would follow up on this issue.

9. ADJOURNMENT –

Motion: To adjourn the Traffic Safety and Parking Committee (TSPC) meeting until it's next regular scheduled meeting on March 7, 2007 at 6:00 p.m.

(M/Maez, S/Howard): 4-0-0 - Approved. Meeting Adjourned, 8:07 pm.